

UNITED WISDOM

Directness and politeness: hearing a request beneath an unfamiliar form

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-23-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Directness and politeness: hearing a request beneath an unfamiliar form

Epigraph

> *You are very frank*

Henry James, *The American*, Chapter X. Madame de Bellegarde addresses Newman after discussing his intentions and income. A short sentence from a fictional response. Text.

What this article is about

Consider Lena, who writes to her colleague Mark: send the corrected file today. She considers this an ordinary work request. Mark hears an instruction and cautiously asks whether they might return to it later. Lena interprets the question as reluctance to speak plainly. They are already prepared to explain each other through national character, although they have not clarified the task's status, deadline, or availability of refusal. The characters and scenes are fictional. Their countries are deliberately unspecified: a passport does not explain a particular response on someone's behalf.

How can a request's content, form, and actual freedom to answer be distinguished in an unfamiliar cultural context? Our sources are a selected scene in James, Ogiermann's primary research, and *Analects* III.15 in Legge's translation. They retain different foundations. We offer voluntary clarification of one speech act rather than a universal dictionary of peoples. It guarantees neither agreement nor correct interpretation of every hint or protection within power relations. Someone can preserve their own way of speaking while learning what another person heard.

I. A short sentence communicates less than its author assumes

Lena knows she usually speaks quickly and does not intend to command Mark. He lacks access to that entire internal context. The sentence he receives names an action and deadline without explaining whether the deadline was previously accepted, whether a choice exists, or what follows refusal. This does not automatically make Lena rude. Her own calm intention nevertheless does not establish that the same meaning is available to its recipient. Our scene needs a small bridge between intention and the action heard. A request can be named as such without recounting an entire character history or demanding trust in every future abbreviation.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Mark can also assign too much to form. Brevity does not prove a wish to humiliate or use power. Perhaps this work group normally writes without introductions; perhaps Lena is replying between other tasks; perhaps the deadline was already agreed. These explanations are only possibilities. The most pleasant should not be selected and the question declared settled. Nor can the least pleasant become an established intention from one verb. It helps to ask how the sentence relates to an action: is it a new request or a reminder of an accepted one? This checks significant meaning rather than the message's author's entire upbringing.

One action may also have several components. Lena wants the file, wants it today, and wants to know whether that is possible. Mark can accept the first without confirming the second. If an answer is understood only as an overall yes or no to the person, a partial answer disappears. He can say the file will be prepared but today's deadline is unavailable. That does not make the request pointless. It permits its conditions to be discussed separately. Our article establishes no actual work duties, which require foundations of their own. It considers a conversation where both participants have not yet accepted a new deadline that cannot be depicted as a joint decision.

The first question may therefore be what someone is doing with a sentence rather than how direct they are. Are they requesting, warning, proposing, reminding, refusing, or communicating an established condition? Identical words can participate in different actions. Terminology is unnecessary if an ordinary explanation suffices. Lena can say: I want to know whether you can send it today; otherwise, we need another deadline. Mark can clarify which file is meant. Their styles remain different, but the subject of an answer becomes more accessible. This is a possible fictional outcome rather than demonstrated effectiveness for every conversation and culture.

II. A cultural framework helps us ask but cannot read minds

Someone may know that requests are usually softened in one environment while brevity is valued in another. Such knowledge helps notice an unfamiliar form. It does not assign meaning to a particular person. Mark may have studied in one country, worked in another, developed his own preferences, and spoken differently with people close to him. Lena need not represent her birthplace's general norm either. If cultural explanation closes the question, it deprives both of a chance to clarify a personal act. It is better retained as a working hypothesis: perhaps we mark requests differently; let us establish what is needed now and what answer is really available.

Unfamiliarity is not disrespect, but reference to culture does not justify every interaction. When someone is publicly humiliated, punished for refusal, or required to remain silent about consequences, the issue exceeds speaking style. They cannot be obliged to accept pressure for intercultural openness. Our practice stops in those conditions; concrete assistance and

protection depend on circumstances. This article supplies no universal escape from unequal relationships. It preserves the possibility of naming an act unpleasant or coercive without a verdict on an entire people, and without allowing a cultural framework to hide what occurred in a particular encounter.

A personal habit does not automatically become a neutral standard either. Lena may consider every short request normal and every cautious one strange. Mark may consider only familiar softening respectful. In both cases, a personal vocabulary becomes the standard while its origin goes unnamed. A preference can be acknowledged in the first person: answering is easier for me when a question leaves the deadline open; I prefer a definite refusal to a lengthy introduction. These statements prove no language superior. They supply information about this pair and should not expand into a demand that everyone always speak in one convenient form.

Sometimes a local convention really needs learning within an institution, work process, or accepted ritual. Someone or something relevant to that environment is then useful rather than a rule inferred from a national label. A convention may have exceptions, change, and differ between groups. A participant may not know it immediately. If form relates to an actual obligation, however, declaring everything personal style is insufficient. The accepted content and requirement's source need establishing. This article supplies no such source for a reader; it leaves room for particular learning rather than shame because a familiar form proved unfamiliar to someone else.

III. Request research retains its task's conditions

Ogiermann studied written responses from students in four language groups to a scenario of borrowing another student's lecture notes. This is a prescribed scenario rather than recordings of all daily conversations. Questions predominated in every group in the selected situation, with differences in softening. We therefore adopt no division into wholly direct and wholly indirect peoples. The conclusion remains limited to the read design. Primary publication.

This does not determine which sentence Lena and Mark must choose. The study investigated neither their work partnership nor their present file deadline. It helps limit the overly broad confidence with which they are about to describe cultures. Their own clarification is then needed: are they familiar with each other, equal in authority, already agreed about the deadline, and facing particular costs of answering? These questions belong to our editorial scene. They are neither a repeated experiment nor a scientifically validated conversational protocol. Research can serve as a limited reference without being made to decide for two people what it collected no data about.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A written academic task also supplies no complete intonation of live speech. Our scene's message contains no voice, gesture, or surrounding conversation. Mark may hear it as stricter than Lena intended. That is a possible fictional arrangement rather than an established general mechanism of correspondence. If intonation matters, they can choose an available explanation or another format without having to call immediately. A different form requires time and consent. A spoken conversation can remain unclear too. A medium should be chosen for a particular question without declaring one channel guaranteed sincere and another inevitably cold or rude.

Nor can a selected linguistic form become an assessment of dignity. A direct proposal can be intelligible and an indirect one considerate; either can be used for pressure. Our text establishes no enduring character from a construction. Lena can choose to learn a new form or explain her previous one. A reader need not change habitual speech completely for one episode. It is enough to see where meanings diverged and decide whether to clarify now. Cultural learning preserves independence when it avoids turning someone into a defective specimen of a native-language speaker requiring urgent correction.

IV. A fictional character's frankness does not establish equality

In Chapter X of *The American*, Madame de Bellegarde acknowledges Newman's frankness after discussing his intention to marry and his wealth, then promises to reply similarly. This fictional exchange occurs within family and social power. We compare only explicitly naming a way of answering. The novel's national types, financial assessment, and familial authority are not adopted as relationship norms. The characters' directness proves no freedom for everyone involved. Context.

Lena and Mark can also name how they intend to answer. A promise of plain speech grants no right to demand any personal information, however. If a conversation concerns a file, the answer's content is limited to the file. Someone can honestly say a deadline is unavailable without revealing reasons they wish to keep private. Another may feel disappointed without obtaining the entire personal context. Frankness has a subject and voluntary scope. Our scene benefits from distinguishing an intelligible statement about action from complete transparency of life. An independent answer survives when explanation is shorter than another's curiosity or offers no convenient way to judge a refusal's respectfulness.

Equality does not arise from identical degrees of directness either. If Lena distributes tasks and Mark depends on her assessment, apparently identical words carry different costs. Actual role and form need distinguishing. A subordinate may speak politely because refusal has consequences; a manager may speak gently while still establishing a condition. Our article determines no agreements for this pair. It does not allow a request to be declared free merely because it contains a question mark. If refusal is actually unavailable, that limit should be

named. A good sentence can make it visible without necessarily removing power, changing an agreement, or guaranteeing objection will have no consequences.

Nor can fiction supply ready proof that money replaces respect. The novel's people act within their historical conditions; our editorial question is narrower. How can an intention to answer be shown without borrowing someone else's power over life? Lena can acknowledge that her wording sounded like an order and explain her request. Mark can acknowledge reading more than was written. Neither acknowledgment requires abandoning a noticed problem. One part can be corrected while the rest remains disputed. Literature supports that question when retaining its own complexity rather than becoming a convenient collection of lines for controlling another's agreement.

V. Clarifying a rule can be part of respect for form

In *Analects* III.15, the Master asks about everything in the temple; challenged about knowledge of propriety, he answers that asking itself belongs to propriety. This is a ritual context within a particular tradition. We compare the limited possibility of learning through a question, without making contemporary conversation a temple act. The text's hierarchy and religious foundation retain their difference. Legge's translation and surroundings.

A question that does not become an accusation may help Mark: how are new deadlines usually marked here? He need not pretend to understand everything to appear well-mannered. Lena may answer that no group rule exists and that she writes by personal habit. Ignorance then need not be masked with an invented cultural norm. An answer can remain specific: a short request suits me, but the deadline is negotiable. This supplies information within the scene rather than a rule for every worker or language. Clarification helps only where available and where someone can answer rather than merely being obliged to soothe a person making a cultural complaint.

Asking about everything is not obligatory. Another's time is limited, and a question may be unsuitable now. Proportionality preserves the specific task: what changes an answer or promise? If Lena needs a file, Mark's entire history of speech conventions is unnecessary. If Mark needs an intelligible deadline, establishing its status is enough. Other differences can remain unexplained. The article proposes no examination of mutual openness. Every conversation need not end with a lecture about tradition. The right to learn through questions also preserves brief answers, postponed explanation, and acknowledgment of lacking knowledge about a norm others expected someone to communicate.

Clarification can occur after an awkward sentence. The event should not then be rewritten as though it never happened. Lena can say she heard the objection and is now changing her request's form. Mark can separately name the deadline he can confirm. An immediate feeling

of respect need not be demanded. An unpleasant trace sometimes persists after an intelligible correction. The practice does not guarantee restored trust. It permits a factual change to be named and checked in a subsequent act. A promise never to command again exceeds today's particular clarification; uncertainty makes an available change more honest than a final declaration about all future speech.

VI. A gentle form should not hide an already made decision

Lena asks whether Mark could send the file today while already deciding that no other deadline will be allowed. The question is formally gentler. Choice's content remains closed, however. Mark may spend time explaining impossibility, believing his answer can influence a decision. Accuracy in our scene therefore concerns the request's status rather than the number of softening words. A deadline set by authority should be communicated as a condition, with consequences discussed through the actual procedure. A proposed deadline needs room for an answer. The article does not establish whether the deadline is lawful; it disallows depicting an unchangeable instruction as a voluntary request for a pleasant impression.

The reverse case matters too. Mark answers vaguely to avoid offending, but Lena hears a promise in his cautious wording. His wish to preserve the relationship is understandable, yet a future file needs its own answer. He can clarify that he has not confirmed today's deadline. This is not necessarily rudeness or abandoning politeness. A respectful form can accompany a clear limit. Our editorial scene determines no universal native-speaker interpretation of hints. It shows a particular cost of indistinguishability: another builds action around a promise nobody intended to give. When that cost occurs, making a limit visible helps more than continuing to dispute whose refusal is more attractive.

Not every uncertainty can be removed immediately. Mark may really not know how long correction will take. Uncertainty is then the answer's content rather than deficient frankness. He can identify when a more definite message becomes possible, if it does, without promising a clarification deadline merely to calm Lena. She can choose action accounting for uncertainty or seek another available solution. A right not to know does not remove a previously accepted obligation, which needs separate consideration. We preserve differences between impossibility, refusal, missing information, and an unfulfilled promise so that one label does not replace different foundations for a next step.

A strong objection is that constant clarification makes ordinary speech heavy. Proportionality is a fair concern. Not every verb or punctuation mark needs an explanation. In a familiar partnership, experience already makes much intelligible. Clarification matters where difference changes expectations, available refusal, or action's cost. One sentence can be checked and the conversation stopped. If both understood, inventing an additional problem is unnecessary. Cultural attentiveness is no obligation to maintain an endless relationship protocol. It helps

ordinary speech remain simple while allowing significant meaning to be revealed when brevity ceases to save both people's effort and starts producing divergent promises.

VII. An answer can preserve style while changing one disputed part

Lena need not become someone who writes lengthy introductions. She can keep brief speech and add a deadline's status. Mark need not abandon caution; he can explicitly state that his question is not yet agreement. This change concerns one part rather than remaking personality entirely. Sometimes people wish to learn more, which is their choice. The article imposes no adaptation as an enduring duty of newcomers or junior participants. Both can learn meaning. If effort is always demanded from one alone, its cost's distribution matters rather than being declared a natural consequence of that person's language seeming unfamiliar to the group.

A particular personal request about form can also help. Mark asks for new deadlines to be marked; Lena asks whether a deadline is confirmed. These are two proposals still requiring agreement. One person's convenience does not automatically impose duty on another. A trial can be accepted for certain messages, exceptions retained, or the proposal declined. Our text does not promise an ideal new partnership standard. It permits a small change to be checked in actual correspondence and reconsidered afterward. Familiar style can stay recognizable, with new information added only where an answer's subject otherwise disappears or it becomes unclear who actually agreed to what.

If someone made a mistake, correction should fit it. A misheard deadline can be clarified, an unfounded assessment of a whole people withdrawn, and a promised but missing file considered as an unfulfilled act. These are different subjects. One overall apology for cultural misunderstanding may be insufficient if it hides a fact another already acted on. Yet complete moral failure need not be admitted for an unsuccessful verb. Accuracy permits needed correction without expanding a verdict. Our scene needs changed text and an actual next step rather than one correct story explaining how Lena or Mark became the kind of person they are.

The result can be modest. Lena learns Mark heard an instruction; Mark learns the deadline is proposed. They need not assess the original sentence identically. Disagreement about its convenience can remain while a new answer about the file is accepted. A joint action may also be declined if available conditions are unsuitable. The practice measures no maturity through agreement. It helps when showing a subject and limit without promising final closeness. People may continue speaking with different degrees of directness. Their difference need not continually invite a decision about who belongs to a more respectful culture and who must remain silent until correcting their origins.

VIII. A request's intelligibility is checked through an available answer

Initially, Lena and Mark assessed each other through form. They can now check something narrower: are the action, deadline, and choice's status intelligible? This does not reduce politeness to technical clarity alone. Tone and relationship history may matter too, but need not absorb all content. An unpleasant form can be acknowledged while knowing what answer is needed; a pleasing form appreciated while noticing choice is closed. Our scene allows both distinctions. Intelligibility is a small conversational result rather than a complete relationship assessment or proof that every subsequent request will now necessarily be heard correctly.

The sources retain their own work. A fictional exchange shows named frankness within an unequal familial context. A research task compares request forms among selected students. A ritual episode allows questioning as part of propriety. They produce no single universal communication law. The editorial proposal is narrower: a speech act and an answer's cost can be learned without assigning someone a national essence. A reader may reject the comparison, choose another vocabulary, or end discussion. A shared question requires no identical foundations and does not establish that traditions secretly taught one modern writing method whose reproduction guarantees mutual respect.

After clarification, action matters. Mark confirmed another deadline or could not accept the task; Lena changed her expectation or stated another solution was needed. These results differ from a good intention. An absent file cannot be considered received because conversation was attentive. A changed deadline need not be declared failure merely because an initial request was not literally fulfilled. The article leaves actual results verifiable within the scene. Culture does not replace a file, and a file proves no freedom to answer; both subjects remain without a mandatory overall verdict on one speaking style or the whole person.

Directness and politeness remain living forms of relationship when neither requires the other person's disappearance. Someone can request clearly while leaving room to answer, soften without hiding refusal, and learn a rule without shame about questioning. These are editorial proposals rather than promised outcomes for everyone. Access, time, and consequences matter within a particular encounter. A person need not win a competition between cultures to name a limit. Sometimes one request can simply end with an accurate answer while differences in language and habit remain open. An unfamiliar form then ceases automatically to prove another's rudeness or one's own inability to live among other people.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one safe request. Name the action, deadline, and its status: an accepted condition, new proposal, or uncertainty. Clarify what answer you heard and what the other person intended to give. Assign them no opinion held by everyone in their country. Demand no personal reason for refusal when an available deadline suffices. This is a voluntary editorial trial rather than a scientifically established protocol.

One part of a sentence can be changed: state that a deadline is negotiable, that consent is not yet given, or that a condition really is established by a specified role. Depict no closed decision as free choice. Declare no agreement obtained from one cautious response. Stop under humiliation, threat, or punishment for an answer; needed assistance and protection do not depend on skill at selecting a culturally pleasant form.

Later, check a small result: are the request, confirmation, and remaining unknowns clearer? Partial answers, another deadline, and refusal are possible. Trust, agreement, and respectful treatment are not guaranteed. A former style can remain with only an essential explanation added. The aim is not to remove every unfamiliarity but to avoid building action on a promise one person heard while another never gave it.

Key quotation

> *I will be the same.*

Henry James, *The American*, Chapter X. Madame de Bellegarde's next short sentence in the same exchange. It promises a manner of answering; the scene does not become a norm of family authority. Text.

Connections between traditions

Read reference	Limited comparison	Difference
James, X	A way of answering is named	Fictional family power rather than a model of peoples
Ogiermann (2009)	Request form has conditions	Written student scenario rather than all live speech
Analects III.15	Clarification can belong to propriety	Temple ritual rather than a universal modern norm

Sources

1. Henry James. The American, Chapter X; Gutenberg 177. Metadata and selected context 2186–2223 were read. Electronic version updated 23 February 2021; particular print basis not established. Fictional national types are not adopted; territorial rights UNKNOWN.

2. Eva Ogiermann. Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. Journal of Politeness Research 5(2), 2009, 189–216; DOI 10.1515/JPLR.2009.011. Version information, methods, selected results, and conclusion were read. Portal conditions restrict further distribution of the material itself; only a short independent comparison and link appear here, without research quotations.

3. Confucius. Analects III.15, James Legge; Gutenberg 3330. Metadata and III.9–16 context were read. English portion of Chinese Classics; updated 8 January 2021, print basis not established. Chinese original not compared; no direct quotations, rights UNKNOWN.

Tags

directness, politeness, request, speech form, cultural context, clarification, speech act, meaning, intention, heard meaning, deadline, answer, refusal, choice, authority, power, work correspondence, language, independence, respect, promise, consent, answer cost, uncertainty, boundaries, learning, habit, Henry James, The American, Eva Ogiermann, Confucius, Analects, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.